



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,315	03/21/2001	Gordon Earle	23265-011	3772
30623 7590 01/24/2008 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111			EXAMINER LU, KUEN S	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,315

Applicant(s)

EARLE ET AL.

Examiner

Kuen S. Lu

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1-2. The Action is responsive to the Applicants' Amendments, filed on November 2, 2007.

3-4. Concerning the Applicants' Remarks on claim rejections, filed on November 2, 2007, has been fully considered by the Examiner. Please see discussions in the section ***Response to Arguments***, following the Action, as shown next.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicants is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 1, 14 and 22-25 are rejected under U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAPP (Oracle® Applications Concepts, Release 11 for UNIX, 1998, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAPP"), in view of OraInv (Oracle® Inventory Technical Reference Manual, Release 11i, December 1999, Oracle®, hereafter "OraInv") and further in view of OraAdm (Oracle® Applications System Administrator's Guide, Release 11, March 1998, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAdm").

As per claims 1, 14 and 22, OraAPP teaches the following:

“a web server implementing a user interface to said system” (See Fig. 1-1 and Pages 1-2, 1-3 and 1-6 where web server serves client web browser to communicate with other tiers in the Oracle Application System); and

“a database server in operable communication with the web server, the database server comprising a data architecture representing the business process” (See Fig. 1-1, Pages 1-2, 1-8 and 2-1 to 2-3 where database contains Oracle Application data and architecture to support business processes, such as MRP, Financials and EDI, etc).

OraAPP does not specifically teach **“an entity model representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process”**, although OraAPP teaches modeling sales and marketing analysis under application environment AS_TOP at Pages 2-3 and 2-4.

However, OraInv teaches **“an entity model representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process”** (See Page 2-16 and Diagram 2: Inventory Setup where Inventory Setup model comprises entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES are part of setting up inventory business process).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants' invention was made to combine the teachings of OraInv and OraAPP because OraAdm and OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, etc. and OraInv is a component product of financial applications, and the

Art Unit: 2167

combination would have enabled material inventory users to utilize concurrent managers to submit processes to be processed concurrently or in-parallel in the background while continue performing fore-ground tasks for performance improvement.

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references further teaches the following:

“a transaction model representing at least one transaction in the business process in which the entity is involved” (See OraInv: Pages 2-10, 2-23 and Diagram 9 wherein OraInv's miscellaneous transactions model performing miscellaneous issues to and receipts from accounts involving entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES); and

“a plurality of list objects associated with at least one step in the transaction, each of the list objects comprising a list of at least one state or set of information that can be attained by or is associated with the entity involved in the transaction, wherein the state or set of information in the list is associated with the entity” (See OraAPP: Pages 1-10 and 2-4 where internal concurrent manager processing is the model to monitor the database table for new requests, control the other concurrent managers and determine when a transaction request from a component product, such as Inventory's miscellaneous transactions, should be processed and which concurrent manager should carry it out, and OraInv: Pages 2-62 and 3-5 where INVTMTX is the concurrent program form to perform inventory miscellaneous transactions involving entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and

MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES where concurrent program populates inventory data to change inventory status and state).

The combined teaching of OraApp and OraInv references does not explicitly teach "at least one rule configured to logically remove the entity from a first list object and add the entity to a second list object based on the state or set of information associated with the entity".

However, OraAdm teaches "at least one rule configured to logically remove the entity from a first list object and add the entity to a second list object based on the state or set of information associated with the entity" (See Pages 6-3 and 7-30 where user's number of transactions, [the requests for concurrent processes], is limited to a maximum predefined in the user's profile, and the transactions are queued and removed to the running queue once active processes of the user, [a removal from the first list and inserted to a second], is below the maximum, [a change of state associated with the transactions]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants' invention was made to combine the teaching of OraAdm with the OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAdm teaches subject matter of OraApp in much more detail and the combined teaching of the references would have provided an in-depth description of a integrated financials system in which WORKFLOW, CRM, MRP, HRMS and OraInv are component products, and the combination would have enabled component products users to utilize concurrent managers to submit processes to be

processed concurrently or in-parallel in the background while continue performing foreground tasks for performance improvement.

The combined teaching of OraAdm, OraApp and Oralnv references further teaches “a task model associated with the list, the task model representing at least one task associated with the at least one step in the transaction” (See OraAPP: Pages 1-9 and 1-10 where the running concurrent processes are the executable programs operate in the background to define and perform the Application tasks as requested, and Oralnv: Pages 2-10, 2-23 and Diagram 9 wherein Oralnv's miscellaneous transactions model performing miscellaneous issues to and receipts from accounts involving entities).

As per claim 23, the combined teaching of OraAdm, Oralnv and OraAPP references teaches “the entity is selected from the group consisting of an organization, a human, and a location” (See Oralnv: Pages 2-22 and 3-576 wherein MTL_PARAMETERS and MTL_USER_DEMAND entities contains organization, location and human data).

As per claim 24, the combined teaching of OraAdm, Oralnv and OraAPP references teaches “the list model is configured so as to leave the entity model unmodified by its association with the list” (See OraAPP: Pages 1-10 and 2-4 where internal concurrent manager processing is the model to monitor the database table for new requests, control the other concurrent managers and determine when a transaction request from a component product, such as Inventory's miscellaneous transactions, should be processed and which concurrent manager should carry it out, and Oralnv: Pages 2-62

and 3-5 where INVTMTX is the concurrent program form to perform inventory miscellaneous transactions involving entities MTL_MATERIAL_TRANSACTIONS, MTL_TRX_SOURCE_TYPES and MTL_TRANSACTION_TYPES where concurrent program populates inventory data to change inventory status and state, however, the entity models remain unmodified during the concurrent program execution).

As per claim 25, the combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references teaches "the task represented in the task model is also associated with the entity" (See OraAPP: Pages 1-9 and 1-10 where the running concurrent processes are the executable programs operate in the background to define and perform the Application tasks as requested, and OraInv: Pages 2-10, 2-23 and Diagram 9 wherein OraInv's miscellaneous transactions model performing miscellaneous issues to and receipts from accounts involving entities).

7. Claim 2, 5-13 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OraAPP (Oracle® Applications Concepts, Release 11 for UNIX, 1998, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAPP"), in view of OraInv (Oracle® Inventory Technical Reference Manual, Release 11i, December 1999, Oracle®, hereafter "OraInv") and OraAdm (Oracle® Applications System Administrator's Guide, Release 11, March 1998, Oracle®, hereafter "OraAdm"), as applied to claims 1, 14 and 22 above, and further in view of OraSAM (Oracle® Sales and Marketing Connected Client User's Guide, Release 11, March 1988, Oracle®, hereafter "OraSAM").

As per claim 2, the combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a database server comprising data architecture representing a business process as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections, furthermore, the OraAPP references teaches concurrent managers running on concurrent server(s) for controlling concurrent and parallel processes (See Pages 1-9 and 1-10).

The combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach "individual user specifications (IUS)".

However, OraSAM teaches "individual user specifications" (See Pages 1-17 to 1-21 wherein OraSAM's profile options are available for grouping to define individual users).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants' invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAdm and OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, WORKFLOW, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory, Sales and Marketing users to utilize concurrent managers to submit processes to be processed concurrently or in-parallel in the background while continue performing foreground tasks for performance improvement.

OraSAM further teaches "company specific parameters (CSP)" (See Page 2-8 wherein OraSAM's company profile parameters are entered or updated); and "vertical market system parameters (VMSP) including a set of vertical market templates

that operate on top of the data architecture” (See Pages 1-17 to 1-21 wherein OraSAM’s profile options are available for grouping to define a specific site parameters for a particular industry or business).

The combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv, OraAPP and OraSAM references further teaches “a database manager in communication with and operative to manage the IUS, CSP, and VMSP” (See OraAPP: Fig. 1-3, Pages 1-5, 2-4 where IUS, CSP and VMSP are defined and operated under Sales and Marketing which is a component product in the Marketing Management family of Oracle Applications whose tier communicates with database tier).

As per claim 5, the combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a database server comprising an architecture as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections.

The combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach “an activities model”.

However, OraSAM teaches “an activities model” (See Page 6-5 wherein OraSAM’s an user account activity table is created to manage user activities).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants’ invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAdm and OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, WORKFLOW, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory,

Sales and Marketing users to utilize concurrent managers to submit user account activity processes to be processed concurrently or in-parallel in the background while continue performing fore-ground tasks for performance improvement.

As per claim 6, the combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references an entity model representing an entity responsible for implementing Sales and Marketing processes as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections.

The combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach the entity model comprising "an entity list representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process".

However, OraSAM teaches "an entity list representing at least one entity responsible for implementing at least a portion of the business process" (See Pages 3-2 and 4-2 wherein OraSAM's listing contacts information and registering contact for events).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants' invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAdm and OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, WORKFLOW, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Sales and Marketing users to utilize information from other integrated product entities such that business processes of Sales and Marketing could have been operated properly.

OraSAM further teaches the following:

"a core record of information coupled to the entity list and operative to store core

information" (See Page 3-8 wherein OraSAM's contact's private mailing address is listed, updated and saved);

"a lookup table for entity types coupled to the entity list and operative to store information associated with entity types" (See Pages 2-12 and 2-13 wherein OraSAM's interest type is selected from a list and saved for updating the company information);

"a table of entity sub types coupled to the entity list and operative to store entity sub types" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc);

"a lookup table of entity sub types coupled to the table of entity sub types and operative to store information associated with entity sub types" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc);

"a table of entity relationships coupled to the entity list and operative to store entity relationship information" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. and a secondary code from a list of values where the relation established between type, primary and secondary codes); and

"a lookup table of entity relationship types coupled to the table of entity relationships and operative to store information associated with entity relationships" (See Page 2-14

wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. and a secondary code from a list of values where the relation established between and operated on type, primary and secondary codes).

As per claim 7, OraSAM further teaches "the entity types are a function of at least one of company specific system parameters and vertical market system parameters" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's account is classified into type, primary and secondary hierarchically specific to the organization's product and customers).

As per claim 8, the combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a transaction model comprising at least one transaction in the business process as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections wherein Sales and Marketing is one model integrated to the Applications model.

The combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach "a plurality of transactions, each transaction being associated with at least one entity".

However, OraSAM teaches "a plurality of transactions, each transaction being associated with at least one entity" (See Pages 7-6 and 7-7 wherein OraSAM's customers place orders and each order is associated with entities such as sales rep, sales channel and product agreement).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants' invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAdm and OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, WORKFLOW, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory, Sales and Marketing users to utilize information from other integrated product entities such that business processes of customer order details could have been operated properly.

OraSAM further teaches "a plurality of transaction details tables (TDT), each TDT associated with a transaction and including high-level information about the associated transaction" (See Pages 7-6 and 7-7 wherein OraSAM's order line items details customer orders and each line item associated with information such as list price, selling price and discount associated with the order transaction).

As per claim 9, the combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references teaches a list model representing at least one step in the transaction as previously described in claims 1, 14 and 22 rejections.

The combined teaching of OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references does not specifically teach "a lookup table of lists associated with the list of at least one entity".

However, OraSAM teaches "a lookup table of lists associated with the list of at least one entity" (See Pages C1 to C-10 wherein OraSAM's table for QuickCode lookup type

is provided for Sales and Marketing QuickCode for lookup types and default values associated with entities such as contacts, events and sales).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicants' invention was made to combine the teachings of OraSAM, OraAdm, OraInv and OraAPP references because OraAdm and OraAPP teaches an integrated system for financials, MRP, HRMS, WORKFLOW, etc. and OraInv and OraSAM are component products of financial applications, and the combination would have enabled Inventory, Sales and Marketing users to utilize information from other integrated product entities such that business processes of Sales and Marketing could have been operated properly.

As per claim 10, OraSAM further teaches "at least one of the objects further comprises a lookup table of list categories associated with the lookup table of lists and operative to group lists into categories" (See Pages C-1 to C-10 wherein OraSAM's QuickCode lists group into categories such as events, environment and contacts).

As per claims 11, 18 and 19, OraSAM further teaches "at least one of the list objects further comprises: lookup tables for lists-to-be-added-to lists-to-be-removed-from, and list-tasks-to-add, the lookup tables associated with the lookup table of lists" (See Page C-5 wherein OraSAM's lookup code for event facility type, collateral request status and lead status types have values similar to lists-to-be-added-to lists-to-be-removed-from, list-tasks-to-add and list-tasks-to-add suggests the teaching of tables for lists-to-be-

added-to lists-to-be-removed-from, and list-tasks-to-add, the lookup tables associated with the lookup table of lists).

As per claims 12 and 20, OraSAM further teaches "at least one of plurality of list objects further comprises: a lookup table for list-cycle-steps associated with the lookup table of lists; and lookup tables for list-cycle-steps-to-add-to, list-cycle-steps-to-remove-from, and list-cycle-step-tasks-to-add, each lookup table being associated with the list-cycle-steps table" (See Pages C-1 to C-10 wherein OraSAM's QuickCode lookup table teaches list-cycle-steps in the interaction type and list-cycle-steps-to-add-to, list-cycle-steps-to-remove-from, and list-cycle-step-tasks-to-add in the event facility type, collateral request status and lead status types).

As per claim 13, OraSAM further teaches "lists is capable of having associated meta-data" (See Page C-5 wherein OraSAM's user-maintained list of values for event facility type is an item of data about data).

As per claim 15, OraSAM further teaches "modifying the entity model by modifying at least one of entity types, entity sub types, and entity relationships" (See Page 2-14 wherein OraSAM's the company classification is updated saved by selecting a type from a list of values, such as "sector", "hardware", etc and a subtype from a list of primary codes such as "commercial", "federal", "public", etc. and a secondary code from a list of

values where the relation established between and operated on type, primary and secondary codes).

As per claim 16, OraSAM further teaches “modifying the plurality of list objects by adding associations to an existing list to track additional information about list members” (See Pages 7-7 and 7-8 wherein OraSAM's customer order line items are modified to associate and track customer order).

As per claim 17, OraSAM further teaches “the list of at least one entity comprises a list entity record and wherein the method further comprises marking the list entity record as removed when at least one of an entity and an entity-transaction pair is removed from the list” (See Page 11-4 wherein OraSAM's maintenance of scripts questions, answers and actions).

As per claim 21, the combined teaching of OraInv and OraAPP references teaches “action and time-based rules are recursive” (See OraAPP: Page 11-10 wherein OraSAM's script answer actions can be set up to run automatically on regular basis).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants' arguments, filed on November 2, 2007, with respect to claims 1-2 and 5-27 have been fully considered. Please see discussions below.

At Pages 7-8, concerning claims 1-2 and 5-27, the Applicants argued that Examiner's interpretation of entities is not proper and none of the cited references teaches information in a list that is associated with an entity or the limitation of **"at least one rule configured to logically remove the entity from a first list object and add the entity to a second list object based on the state or set of information associated with the entity"**.

As to the above argument, the Examiner respectfully submits that the subject matter as described in the claim language is extremely broad and which could be broadly interpreted. For example, entity is simply a unit, a category or a type (See for example, Page 194, Microsoft® Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, 2002). Transactions as listed in the concurrent requests queue and the requests selves are all could be interpreted as entities. An entity in a corporate organization chart certainly can not be interchanged interpreted as an entity in an object oriented program because both "entity" are very specifically scoped. Similarly, "object" could also be broadly interpreted by an ordinary skilled in the art.

This Examiner would further respectfully submits that each limitation in the claims has been given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and in light of the supporting disclosure in the Action (See MPEP 2106 [R-2], 2111 [R-1]). Please further note In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. > E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369,

67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily).

Concerning the newly amended limitation of "**at least one rule configured to logically remove the entity from a first list object and add the entity to a second list object based on the state or set of information associated with the entity**", Examiner has respectfully introduced an additional reference of OraAdm to provide needed teaching for the limitation.

9. In light of the foregoing arguments and the newly introduced OraAdm reference, the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 1-2 and 5-27 is hereby sustained.

References

10.1. The prior art made of record

U. OraAPP: Oracle® Applications Concepts, Release 11 for UNIX, 1998, Oracle®.

V. OraSAM: Oracle® Sales and Marketing Connected Client User's Guide, Release 11, March 1988, Oracle®.

W. OraInv: Oracle® Inventory Technical Reference Manual, Release 11i, December 1999, Oracle®

Y. Oracle® Applications System Administrator's Guide, Release 11, March 1998, Oracle®

10.2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

- A. U.S. Publication 2002/0049603
- B. U.S. Publication 2002/0103660
- C. U.S. Publication 2003/0187670
- D. U.S. Publication 2003/0083947
- E. U.S. Patent No. 6,523,027
- F. U.S. Patent No. 5,301,320
- G. U.S. Publication 2001/0011295
- H. U.S. Patent No. 6,032,124
- I. U.S. Patent No. 6,073,109

X. The Workflow Management Coalition Specification: The Workflow Reference Model, 19-Jan-95, Workflow Management Coalition, Hampshire, UK

Conclusions

11. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicants is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is (571)-272-4114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am-5:00 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone pre unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571)-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Page 13 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-27-9197 (toll free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kuen S Lu,

Primary Patent Examiner



Art Unit 2167

January 22, 2008